

REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 1 is amended to clarify “changing to a new cell in a different location area than the first cell without performing a location area update and without performing a routing area update, if the establishment request is ‘emergency call’” and add “changing to a new cell in a different location area than the first cell and performing a location area update and performing a location area update or a routing area update, if the establishment request is ‘originating conversation call’.” These changes are based at least on FIG. 2 and the accompanying description on page 4 line 22 to page 5 line 26 of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claims 2, 9, and 10 have been amended to maintain strict antecedent basis in light of the amendment to claim 1.

Claims 16 and 20 have also been amended to differentiate between “emergency call” establishment cause and “originating conversation call” establishment cause. These changes are based at least on FIG. 2 and the accompanying description on page 4 line 22 to page 5 line 26 of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,127,250 (Gallagher) and US 2003/0157923 (Tani) in view of US 2003/0003928 (Marjelund)

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Gallagher, Tani, and Marjelund does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claims 1 and 20, as amended. Specifically, amended independent claims 1 and 20 require “changing to a new cell in a different location area than the first cell without performing a location area update and without performing a routing area update, if the establishment request is ‘emergency call’” and

“changing to a new cell in a different location area than the first cell and performing a location area update or a routing area update, if the establishment request is ‘originating conversation call’” which are not taught or suggested in the combination of Gallagher, Tani, and Marjelund.

Gallagher describes a location update to be unnecessary only when the MS (mobile station) selects a GSM cell which has the same LAI (location area identifier) as the IAN (indoor access network) IBS (indoor base station). Gallagher decision of not making a location update is independent of the fact that the call type is an “emergency call” or an “originating conversation call” (non-emergency call). In both cases (assuming that the GSM LAI is equal to the IAN-IBS LAI), Gallagher does not make a location update. See Gallagher col. 16, lines 11-43.

Applicant recites omitting a location update upon changing to a new cell in a different location area if the call establishment cause is “emergency call.” Otherwise, Applicant recites performing a location area update upon changing to a new cell in a different location area if the call establishment cause is “originating conversation call.” Tani describes providing a higher probability of emergency call being processed in situations in which there is a high rate of generation of emergency calls. Tani does not at all talk about omitting a location update under any conditions. See Tani Abstract. Marjelund only describes re-initiating the RRC connection setup in a standard re-direction procedure. See Marjelund para [0049].

Therefore, the combination of Gallagher, Tani, and Marjelund do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of “changing to a new cell in a different location area than the first cell without performing a location area update and without performing a routing area update, if the establishment request is ‘emergency call’” and “changing to a new cell in a different location area than the first cell and performing a location area update and performing a routing area update, if the establishment request is ‘originating conversation call’” as recited by independent claims 1 and 20, so Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 20 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) over Gallagher, Tani, and Marjelund.

Dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7, and 9-15 depend from, and include all the limitations of, independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7, and 9-15 and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher and Tani in view of Marjelund.

Rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,127,250 (Gallagher) and US 2003/0003928 (Marjelund) in view of US 2003/0157923 (Tani)

As described above Gallagher does not make a location update when the MS (mobile station) selects a GSM cell which has the same LAI (location area identifier) as the IAN (indoor access network) IBS (indoor base station). Gallagher's decision to not make a location update is independent of whether the call type is an "emergency call" or an "originating conversation call" (non-emergency call). In both cases, Gallagher does not make a location update. See Gallagher col. 16, lines 11-43. In contrast, Applicant recites not performing a location update upon redirecting to a new cell in a different location area if the call establishment cause is "emergency call." Otherwise, Applicant recites performing a location area update upon redirecting to a new cell in a different location area if the call establishment cause is "originating conversation call."

Therefore, the combination of Gallagher, Marjelund, and Tani do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of "redirecting to a new cell in a different location area than the old cell and returning to step (a) without performing a location area update, if the establishment request is 'emergency call'" and "redirecting to a new cell in a different location area than the old cell and performing a location area update, if the establishment request is 'originating conversation call'" as recited by independent claim 16.

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that claim 16 is not obvious in view of the combination of Gallagher, Marjelund, and Tani, and therefore that the rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

By: <u>/Sylvia Chen/</u>	<u>20JUL2007</u>
Sylvia Chen	Date
Attorney for Applicant	
Registration No. 39,633	
Tel. No. (847) 523-1096	
Fax No. (847) 523-2350	
Email: Sylvia.Chen@motorola.com	